



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,532	02/06/2002	Hiroshi Nomiya	JP9-2000-0421US1	3394

7590 06/30/2005

Marc D. McSwain  
IBM Corporation Almaden Research Center  
Intellectual Property Law (C4TA/J2B)  
650 Harry Road  
San Jose, CA 95120-6099

EXAMINER

VU, KIEU D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/072,532

Applicant(s)

NOMIYAMA ET AL.

Examiner

Kieu D. Vu

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 13-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 13-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed on 04/07/05.
2. Applicant's election of group I (claims 1-10 and 13-27) in the reply filed on 04/07/05 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
3. Claims 1-10 and 13-27 are pending.  
Claims 11-12 and 28 have been canceled.
4. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) based upon application 2001-0815 filed in Japan on 01/05/2001. A claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) cannot be based on said application, since the United States application was filed more than twelve months thereafter.

### ***Claim Objections***

5. Claim 21 is objected since it has a typographical error as follows:  
In line 3 of the claim, it appears that the phrase "are displayed" is redundant.  
Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
7. Claims 6-8, 18-19, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2173

8. Claim 6 recites the limitation "the individual sites" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The same rationale is applied to claims 7-8 which are dependents of claim 6.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "the sentence level" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 18 recites the limitation "the individual sites" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The same rationale is applied to claim 19 which is a dependent of claim 18.

Claim 26 recites the limitation "the individual sites" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 1-3, 6-9, 13, 18-19, 22, 24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Weiss et al ("Weiss", US Publication 2002/0138487 A1)

Regarding claims 1, 13, and 24, Weiss teaches an information rearrangement method for rearranging information obtained from information sources connected via a network comprising: an information collection step of collecting information from a

predetermined number of registered sites (Spider application for scanning Web sites and database application for storing data collected by the Spider application) ([0147], [0148]); an information element extraction step extracting, from among said collected information, information elements that include the same facts that are referred at multiple sites (searching of Web sites that contains the search criteria) ([0149], [0150]) and display step displaying the contents said extracted information elements while changing the display state said contents accordance with the number of sites whereat said facts are referred to (Fig. 12) ([0158]).

Regarding claim 2, Weiss teaches said information elements that convey the same facts are extracted together with of keywords that represent said information elements ([0137]).

Regarding claim 3, Weiss teaches a set of important information elements on a sentence ("Charlie's Angels") are extracted from a group composed of predetermined number of sites, and the display for the same sets important information elements is folded (Entertainment is folded, a click on Entertainment will unfold it and will present countries ([0137], [0139]).

Regarding claims 6, 18, and 26, Weiss teaches an information rearrangement method for arranging information obtained from information a network comprising an information collection step periodically crawling a group of registered sites and collecting information (spider program) ([0008], [0147], [0155]); an information element extraction step extracting, from among set of information elements at the individual sites in said group, information elements that convey the

Art Unit: 2173

same facts (searching of Web sites that contains the search criteria) ([0149], [0150]); and an importance level calculation step providing an importance level in accordance with the number of sites that are referred to ([0031], [0032]).

Regarding claim 22, Weiss teaches an information processing system, for processing information obtained from multiple sites that connected via a network, comprising: a webcrawler, for crawling registered sites across a network (spider program) ([0008], [0147], [0155]); metadata DB (database), for storing metadata from which information elements are extracted from content referred to by using a URL ([0047]); an important information element extraction mechanism, reading information stored said metadata DB and extracting important information elements based matching level information elements; an important information element DB, for storing said extracted important information elements ([0031], [0032]); and result display mechanism, visually presenting said stored important information elements (Fig. 12) ([0158]).

Regarding claims 7 and 19, Weiss teaches at said information element extraction step, from new keywords that are revised by periodical crawling, said information elements that include the same facts extracted while taking account a matching level relative to a proper noun that can be the subject of said facts ([0106]).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2173

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 4-5, 16-17, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiss and Brown et al (USP 5875446).

Regarding claims 4, 16, and 25, Weiss teaches an information rearrangement method rearranging information obtained from information sources connected via network comprising:

an information collection step of collecting information from a predetermined number of registered sites (Spider application for scanning Web sites and database application for storing data collected by the Spider application) ([0147], [0148]);

an information element extraction step extracting, from among said collected information, information elements that include the same facts that are referred at multiple sites (searching of Web sites that contains the search criteria) ([0149], [0150]); and topic keyword extraction step extracting topic keyword that represents the entire set of information elements to be extracted (searching for topic "Charlie's Angels") ; and display step displaying the contents of said extracted information elements (Fig. 12) ([0158]).

Weiss differs from the claim in that Weiss does not teach displaying said extracted topic keyword at a position different from the contents concerning said information elements. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Brown.

Brown teaches a method for generating a hierarchical grouping of topically and structurally relevant objects in a query context (col 4, lines 43-45). Weiss teaching further comprises displaying said extracted topic keyword at a position ("Installing Windows 95") different from the contents concerning said information elements (see fig.

Art Unit: 2173

13 which shows the position of topic keyword "Installing Windows 95" is above the positions of the search results). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Weiss and Brown before him at the time the invention was made, to apply Brown's teaching in Weiss' searching method to display the topic keyword distinctively.

Regarding claims 5 and 17, Brown further teaches wherein, said display step, when specific items are designated in said displayed topic keyword including multiple items, the contents concerning information elements that belong said specific items displayed, and the contents concerning information elements that belong to a set of items are not pertinent said specific items are masked (Fig. 13 shows only the objects which satisfy the query) ( col. 16, lines 13-29).

13. Claims 8, 14-15, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiss and Lawrence et al (USP 6289342).

Regarding claims 8 and 23, Weiss does not teach important information elements on the sentence level, for which an importance level is provided at said importance level calculation step, are rearranged the descending order of their importance levels and are presented visually. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Lawrence. Lawrence teaches an autonomous citation indexing system in which important information elements are rearranged the descending order of their importance levels (number of citations) and are presented visually (Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Weiss and Lawrence before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the searching method taught by Weiss to include teaching that important information elements are



Art Unit: 2173

rearranged the descending order of their importance levels and are presented visually taught by Lawrence with the motivation being to enable user to quickly and conveniently learn the importance level of displayed information.

Regarding claim 14, Weiss does not teach rearranging said information elements in the descending order of the number of sites that are referred to. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Lawrence. Lawrence teaches an autonomous citation indexing system, the system comprises rearranging said information elements in the descending order of the number of sites that are referred to (number of citations) and are presented visually (Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Weiss and Lawrence before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the searching method taught by Weiss to include rearranging said information elements in the descending order of the number of sites that are referred to taught by Lawrence with the motivation being to enable user to quickly and conveniently learn the importance level of displayed information.

Regarding claim 15, Lawrence teaches displaying sets of sentence-level important information elements that are extracted from a group a predetermined number of sites (sentence that contains "dempster"), and folds and hides the same important information element sets (detailed information is "folded and hide" in "Details" link).

14. Claims 9-10, 20-21, and 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiss and Logan (USP 6665659).

Regarding claims 9, 20, and 27, Weiss teaches an information rearrangement method comprising the steps of extracting information elements from multiple sites;

determining whether, of said information elements extracted from said multiple sites, there are relevant information elements convey same facts as sentence-level information elements that constitute an arbitrary web page (Spider application for scanning Web sites and database application for storing data collected by the Spider application) ([0147], [0148]) (searching for topic "Charlie's Angels"); and when said relevant information elements that include the same facts as said sentence-level information elements are present in said information elements obtained from said multiple sites (searching of Web sites that contains the search criteria) ([0149], [0150]). Weiss does not teach adding remark information to said sentence-level information elements to provide information concerning said arbitrary web page. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Logan. Logan teaches a system for distributing electronic information (col 1, lines 7-10), the system comprises adding remark information to provide information concerning a web page (col 5, lines 3-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Weiss and Logan before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the searching method taught by Weiss to include adding remark information to provide information concerning a web page taught by Logan with the motivation being to enable user to provide his or her opinion about the page.

Regarding claims 10 and 21, Logan teaches wherein said web page with said added remark information is displayed, said relevant information elements displayed by designating said remark information (col 5, lines 3-10) (col 8, lines 20-29).

15. The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to

consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach system and method for searching, rearranging information, and displaying information on a display.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kieu D. Vu. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4057.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached at 571-272-4048.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

703-872-9306

and / or:

571-273-4057 (use this FAX #, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communication. Examiners may request that a formal paper / amendment be faxed directly to them on occasions).

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kieu D. Vu  
Patent Examiner

